

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

REC'D 09 FEB 2005  
 WIPO PCT

To:

Albihns Stockholm AB  
P.O. Box 5581  
114 85 Stockholm

PT/2

## PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing (day/month/year) <span style="float: right; font-weight: bold;">02 -02- 2005</span>	
Applicant's or agent's file reference <b>77043</b>	<b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b> See paragraph 2 below
International application No. <b>PCT/SE 2004/001474</b>	International filing date (day/month/year) <b>14.10.2004</b>
Priority date (day/month/year) <b>22.03.2004</b>	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC <b>G06K 19/07, G08B 13/14, H04Q 7/32</b>	
Applicant <b>Hallberg, Tor-Björn et al</b>	

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

### 2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further opinions, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/SE Patent- och registreringsverket Box 5055 S-102 42 STOCKHOLM Facsimile No. +46 8 667 72 88	Authorized officer  Bo Gustavsson /OGU Telephone No. +46 8 782 25 00
--	---

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/SE 2004/001474

**Box No. I**      **Basis of this opinion**

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language, \_\_\_\_\_, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

- ☐ a sequence listing  
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

- ☐ in written format  
☐ in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

- ☐ contained in the international application as filed.  
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.  
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/SE 2004/001474

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	See supplemental box	YES
	Claims	See supplemental box	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	See supplemental box	YES
	Claims	See supplemental box	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	See supplemental box	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: Patent Abstract of Japan, abstract of JP 2004 086 411 A  
D2: US 6 577 238 B1  
D3: Patent Abstract of Japan, abstract of JP 2003 346 254 A  
D4: DE 201 12 099 U1  
D5: Patent Abstract of Japan, abstract of JP 2004 013 789 A

The cited documents (D1-D5) describe systems for monitoring one or more items provided with tags or transponders communicating with a portable interrogation unit. The interrogation unit transmits an interrogation signal having certain characteristics to the transponders, whereby a response signal is retransmitted by the transponders to the interrogation unit. Using the response signal, the interrogation unit determines the relative position of the item comprising the transponder and the interrogation unit, e.g. by determining the signal amplitude, time delay or presence of the response signal. If the distance exceeds a predetermined distance an action such as an alarm signal is activated.

Therefore, the invention as claimed in claims 1-3, 6, 13-15, 22 and 23 lacks novelty in view of any of the documents D1-D5.

In an alternative embodiment according to D2, the transponders in the monitored items may emit bursts of RF energy at predetermined time intervals. If such a response signal is not received by the interrogation unit within a predetermined time interval (see column 2, lines 8-22), an alarm may be triggered.

.../...

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/SE 2004/001474

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of: BOX V., 1.

Novelty (N)	Claims: <u>5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 16, 17, 20, 21, 26-29</u>	YES
	_____	YES
Inventive step (IS)	Claims: <u>1-4, 6, 9, 10, 13-15, 18, 19, 22-25, 30, 31</u>	NO
	_____	NO
	Claims: <u>7, 8, 12, 16, 17, 21, 27-29</u>	YES
	_____	YES
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims: <u>1-6, 9-11, 13-15, 18-20, 22-26, 30, 31</u>	NO
	_____	NO
	Claims: <u>1-31</u>	YES
	_____	YES
	Claims: _____	NO
	_____	NO

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/SE 2004/001474

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of: BOX V., 2.

1(2)

Alternatively, the transponder(s) may, from the transmitted interrogation signal, recognize a certain point in time to respond. A "no response" situation then activates an action. Therefore, the invention as claimed in claims 4, 24 and 25 lacks novelty in view of D2.

The transmitters used in the interrogation units and transponder units described in D1-D5 may be Bluetooth transmitters (D3) or radio frequency transmitters (D1-D5) adapted for short-range transmission.

Therefore, the invention as claimed in claims 9-10, 18 and 19 lacks novelty in view of any of D1-D5.

According to the invention as described in claims 11 and 20, the communication between the interrogation unit and the transponder units is carried out using a telecommunication network. In view of e.g. D1, D3, D4 or D5, this only seems to be one obvious alternative for a person skilled in the art.

Therefore, the invention as claimed in claims 11 and 20 lacks inventive step.

As seen from any of D1 or D3-D5, the interrogation unit may be incorporated into a mobile phone.

Also, as seen from D1, one monitored item may be a credit card.

Therefore, the invention according to claims 30 and 31 lacks novelty.

According to D1, the interrogation unit is incorporated into or attached to a mobile phone and the monitored item may be various valuable possessions, such as wallets or credit cards (see english translation (example 5)). To prevent unauthorized use of a lost credit card, the mobile phone comprising the interrogation unit determines when the monitored item (credit card) is outside the monitored area, i.e. no response signal is detected, and transmits identifications relating to the lost credit card to institutions concerned (banks, companys etc.) via the Internet. Such a measure is considered to be equivalent to the transmission of a deactivating signal to deactivate the monitored item.

.../...

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/SE 2004/001474

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of: BOX V., 2.

2(2)

In the system according to D4, the interrogation unit is incorporated into a mobile phone and the monitored item is a credit card type carrier. According to the document, the primary goal with the described system is to provide a secure communication device and a method for preventing the mobile phone from being lost or stolen. The secure functioning of the device is accomplished by the required cooperation of the mobile phone and the carrier (see page 7, lines 6-31). Thus, the presence of the carrier is necessary for the mobile phone to function properly, while the movement of the carrier outside a predetermined area "deactivates" the mobile phone, i.e. without the transmission of a deactivation signal between the units.

It is therefore considered to be an obvious step for a person skilled in the art to use the teachings of D1 and/or D4 to accomplish a monitoring device as described in claim 5.

Therefore, the invention as claimed in claim 5 lacks inventive step.